

Boulevard Planning Group
Approved- MINUTES/SUMMARY, August 27, 2009
Boulevard Fire and Rescue Inc, Bay Mtg. Area, 39919 Highway 94/Ribbonwood

The meeting was called to order at 7:00 PM. Members present: Jeffrey McKernan, Chris Noland, Pat Stuart, and Donna Tisdale (Chair). Absent: Darlene Koczka (excused) and Cheryl Lenz (excused).

- 1) **MINUTES:** M/S McKernan/Stuart to accept the minutes of August 6th. **PASSED: 4-0-0**
- 2) **CORRESPONDENCE:** The Chair summarized letters received from the County: a) The three long-proposed subdivisions off of Shasta Road were denied under the new County fire code regulations. They didn't have secondary ingress/egress fire access relating to Title 14. This decision is subject to appeal. b) Comments regarding the SDG&E ECO Substation are due by September 9th. This will be an Agenda item at our next meeting.

3) **NEW BUSINESS:**

A. **GENERAL PLAN (GP) UPDATE & DRAFT Environmental Impact Report (EIR):**

- **Draft GP Comments:** Chair Tisdale went through each page of the Draft Comments on Draft General Plan (Revised 7-1-09) from the Boulevard Planning Group (6 pages). She asked for comments/suggestions from the Planning Group members and from those in the audience. The only changes made were regarding typographical errors.

MOTION: M/S McKernan/Noland to submit this document to the County with the typographical errors corrected. PASSED: 4-0-0.

- **GP Draft EIR comments:** Planner Noland commented on the Groundwater Study: a) There are no climatologists on the list of preparers and a significant portion of the document discusses climate change and the impacts of climate change. The other issue is the list of preparers itself. The list is full of consultants who are typically hired to perform groundwater studies for clients that would like to develop their property. It seems like members of academia should have been invited to technically review the content of the material in addition to the consultants who more than likely jumped at the opportunity to provide input. b) There is no rationale behind the use of a certain number of years for precipitation data. This seems erroneous and could yield very different results depending on the number of years of data. Just to use all available data may not be the best method to determine variations in annual precipitation. c) There is no rationale for the use of 34 years of data for precipitation. Please discuss the reasoning behind the 34 years. d) In section 3.5.1 it is stated that groundwater impacts are from high volume users are limited to localized areas within basins. This is erroneous when compared to Barona Valley and surrounding basins that are affected by groundwater in a regional area – not localized. The area of Ranchos Finistierra has also been negatively affected from a high volume user in a different basin. e) Table 3-12 please make a footnote with a disclaimer that the groundwater availability is based on very limited data.

RECEIVED

SEP 09 2009

San Diego County
DEPT. OF PLANNING & LAND USE

f) General concept about the use of the basin approach to determine aquifer storativity could be flawed. Projects that have major groundwater use should not only have to study wells within the basin, but in adjacent basins since groundwater in fractured rock is not always basin dependent. g) Figure 2-3 – Why are records from 1948 used for precipitation when everything else in the report uses 1971 as a starting point? h) On all hydrograph figures: please add trend lines to each well. It is much easier to see a trend line than an oscillating curve. i) General comment about the use of 50% reduction in storage. There are no references that refer to the use of 50% reduction in storage. Please provide detailed rationale why 50% is used. A 25% reduction in storage in some basins could have significant impacts. j) Please provide a cost analysis in general terms about an impacted well owner that would have to drill deeper or drill a new well in case of unmitigated impacts such as a neighbor who decides to put in a farm next door. These scenarios are not uncommon in the backcountry and need to be addressed.

He also commented on the noise technical report was that there is no mention of wind turbines in this section and that needs to be addressed.

MOTION: M/S Tisdale/Stuart to Approve with changes made and addition of Noland's comments on Groundwater Study. PASSED: 4-0-0.

MOTION: M/S Noland/Stuart to add previous comments by Dr. Ponce on Determination of Significance on Groundwater Resources. PASSED: 4-0-0.

- **Draft EIR for the General Plan:** The Chair shared that she had compiled BPG comments into a document called: Draft Boulevard Planning Group Comments on Draft EIR for the General Plan Update 8/27/09 (4 pages). She asked for comments/suggestions from the Planning Group and public as they reviewed each page. Planner Stuart asked that an additional comment for section LU8.2 Groundwater be included similar to the statement we made on the Draft General Plan, asking how the County will judge where "overdraft conditions are foreseeable".

MOTION: M/S McKernan/Stuart that we approve this document with the sentence structure changes and the Groundwater comment above. PASSED: 4-0-0.

B. CONTINUED USE OF THE COMMUNITY CENTER: Discuss and act on the continued historic use of the community center and recent Fire Board decisions to move the community center to the recently installed modular in the rear. Kitchen access would be for fire fighters only. Written commitments are needed from the Fire Board and the County for continued and future Community Center uses and needs. Chair Tisdale informed everyone that Supervisor Jacob has arranged a meeting for October 6th regarding this subject so she felt that no action should be taken at this time. Tisdale said that those invited to the October 6th meeting are: the stakeholders, the Fire Department, and the Chair Tisdale. She suggested that Adam Wilson in the Supervisor's office be contacted if there is an interest in attending the meeting.

4. **PRESENTATION FROM THE FLOOR ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS:** a) the Chair announced once again that there is a vacancy on the Planning Group and the deadline for submitting an application is August 31st. A vote to fill this position will be taken on September 3rd at our regular monthly meeting. b) Tammy Dabauch announced that the Campo Border Patrol Station is sponsoring an all-day fundraiser event hosted by the La Posta Diner on September 12th in honor of Border Patrol agent Robert Rosas. There will be a memorial service at 3 pm. c) Ken Venable expressed his disagreement of the EIR comments and the Chair encouraged him to submit his comments to the County. d) Chair Tisdale mentioned that flyers were available for everyone regarding the Cleveland National Forest's proposal to authorize three Meterological Towers be installed in the Fred Canyon area North of I-8. Each tower is approx. 197 feet in height with 14 guy wires and 12 anchors. The towers will stay up for a max. of three years. September 15th is the comment deadline on this project.

5. **ADJOURNMENT:** The meeting was adjourned at 7:45 PM. Minutes are submitted by Cheryl Lenz, Secretary.

For more information contact
Donna Tisdale, Chair, 619-766-4170,
donnatisdale@hughes.net ,
P. O. Box 1272, Boulevard, CA 91905.